

Message

---

**From:** Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 4/27/2021 2:31:57 AM  
**To:** Sanchez, Yolanda [Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Praskins, Wayne [Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: HPNS | Follow-up on 3/29 meeting re: Buildings Radiological Rework discussion

Thanks. Enrique was surprised by their change of course.

---

**From:** Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 26, 2021 3:05 PM  
**To:** Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: HPNS | Follow-up on 3/29 meeting re: Buildings Radiological Rework discussion

Some language on what our expectations were out of the meeting, when you send an email to Enrique. Maybe something like:

Leaving the March 29 meeting with the Navy on a protective remedy for onsite buildings, we understood the Navy would provide a written proposal to start collecting radiological data at buildings achieving detection limits lower than what the current Parcel G work plan requires. EPA expected this proposal would include a plan to inform background levels of building materials as well as inform an approach to achieve low detection levels.

However, the Navy seemed to take a different approach since March 29. Last Thursday, Derek sent Wayne an Excel spreadsheet that provides information on another RESRAD run. At first glance, it appears the Navy attempted to address some of the concerns EPA had raised about the previous RESRAD runs. Wayne is currently reviewing and coordinating with EPA experts.

We are unclear if the Navy plans to provide a written proposal.

Yolanda

---

**From:** Sanchez, Yolanda  
**Sent:** Friday, April 2, 2021 11:03 AM  
**To:** Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** HPNS | Follow-up on 3/29 meeting re: Buildings Radiological Rework discussion

John,  
I'm glad we had a moment to connect this morning about communications.

As I mentioned, Derek's comments at the BCT meeting had me wondering whether we should be more proactive about communicating our expectations of this forthcoming Navy proposal to do some radiological testing on some buildings at Parcel G. I understand Enrique wanted to wait until we received a proposal. However, it seems that we are unclear on the overall goal the Navy intends to reach with the forthcoming proposal. I recommend we ask him to consider a *very* basic response email providing some expectations of the proposal. I am making some assumptions with the language highlighted below and would want you/Wayne to edit it.

I did not include a sentence on rerunning RRB, as that can wait until we send a more official response letter on the proposal.

#####Draft email#####

Thank you for scheduling and leading the March 29 meeting between the Navy, EPA and the state. We appreciated the opportunity to discuss how to move toward a solution to a protective remedy for the onsite buildings.

At the meeting, the Navy committed to providing a written proposal to start collecting radiological data at buildings achieving detection limits lower than what the current Parcel G work plan requires. EPA expects this proposal will include a plan to inform background levels of building materials as well as inform an approach to achieve low detection levels. As such, it will be important for the proposal to include statistical approaches the Navy may use to analyze the data.

We look forward to reviewing this proposal. Please don't hesitate to reach out to my team to have discussions while the Navy is developing the proposal.

#####

---

Yolanda Sanchez | U.S. EPA, Region 9 | Community Involvement for Superfund | Desk: 415-972-3880